

MINUTES OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

April 26, 2000

The regular monthly meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board was called to order by Chairman Martin at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 26, 2000.

Board Members Present: Melvin Martin, Chair; Gilbert Rogers, Vice Chair; Shirley Long, Secretary; Hemant Patel; Mike Saager; Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio; Tom Callow, Ex Officio.

Staff Members Present: Mike Ellegood, Chief Engineer & General Manager; Julie Lemmon, General Counsel; Tom Johnson, Deputy Chief Engineer/Division Manager; Dick Perreault, CIP/Policy Branch Manager; Joe Tram, Floodplain Delineation Branch Manager; R.W. Shobe, Project Manager; Tim Phillips, Project Manager; Greg Jones, Project Manager; Kathy Smith, Clerk of the FCAB; Monica Ortiz, Administrative Coordinator.

Guests Present: David Moody, City of Peoria; Burton Charron, City of Peoria; Liz Clendenin; Jane Cole; Fred Duren, Huitt-Zollars; Ed Fritz, MCDOT; Brian Fry, Dibble & Assoc.; Mike Heaton, HDR Engineering; Jim Kary, ARCADIS Geraghty & Miller; O'Dell Keil; Ellen Keil; Edward Lowry, Town of Paradise Valley; Mr. & Mrs. John E. Miller, Jr.; Robert G. Mooreman; Eugenia Sucher; Bill Werner, Arizona Game & Fish Dept.

- 1) Recognition of the FCD Employee of the Quarter.

Tom Johnson, Deputy Chief Engineer/Division Manager, introduced Michael Towers to the Board. Mike is a construction manager in the Planning and Project Management Division and managed the recently completed \$11.5 million construction contract for the Bullard Wash Channel.

- 2) Approval of the Minutes of the special meetings of February 17, 2000 & February 21, 2000 and the regular meeting of March 22, 2000.

MR. ROGERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. MR. PATEL SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 3) Zone "A" Floodplain Delineation Program Planning Initiative.

Joe Tram, Floodplain Delineation Branch Manager, presented the Floodplain Delineation Program as a continuation item from last month.

The purpose of the Floodplain Delineation Program is to:

- ✍ Comply with the Arizona Revised Statutes which is a mandate to delineate floodplains
- ✍ Comply with the National Flood Insurance Program
- ✍ Minimize the loss of life and property
- ✍ Minimize the need and necessity to mitigate or remediate flood problems
- ✍ Stay ahead of current and projected population growth

The Arizona Revised Statutes mandates that “the board within its areas of jurisdiction shall delineate or may by rule require developers to delineate for areas where development is ongoing or imminent, and thereafter as development becomes imminent, floodplains consistent with the criteria developed by the director of water resources.”

Mr. Tram pointed out that there are two types of Floodplain Delineations:

- ✍ A Zone “A” delineation is an approximate delineation that uses existing topography and hydrology and generates flood inundation areas.
- ✍ A detailed delineation is one whereby detailed topography is used in conjunction with refined hydrology and hydraulics to generate depths, velocities, and water surface elevations.

The purpose of doing Floodplain Delineations is to:

- ✍ Identify areas susceptible to flooding
- ✍ Prevent future adverse impacts to property from flooding
- ✍ Mitigate existing adverse impacts
- ✍ Maintain a conveyance corridor for the floodwaters
- ✍ Minimize loss of life and property
- ✍ Establish base hydrology and hydraulics as a guide for future development

Mr. Tram responded to the concerns raised at the last FCAB meeting about the extent of public notification for the floodplain delineations. Public notification is made at the three phases of the delineation process:

- ✍ Initiation by the Flood Control District to identify the flood prone areas, prioritize the areas, and obtain the budget and location approval.
- ✍ Technical analysis by the Flood Control District to initiate technical analysis and complete the technical delineation.
- ✍ Federal endorsement by FEMA through review, approval, 90-day appeal process and final delineation published for floodplain management and flood insurance.

Staff recommended that the FCAB approve the Zone “A” Floodplain Delineation Program for inclusion into the FY 00/01 budget and to obtain FCAB concurrence of the current public notification and review procedures for the program.

Discussion:

Rogers: Before a delineation is started, this Board should be notified.

Ellegood: We have no problem in advising the Board as to when we are going to begin delineation. Part of the purpose of this presentation was to provide that knowledge. If you review the map in your handout, there are two areas that we plan to delineate this next fiscal year – Watersheds OO and RR. This is something we are required by statute to do. Yet, it is important that we bring this to the Board so that you know what we are doing. We would be pleased to bring you progress reports or any other information the Board requests.

MR. ROGERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THIS ITEM WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE BOARD BE NOTIFIED OF ANY FUTURE DELINEATIONS BEFORE THEY START. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED AND IT CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 4) Amended Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) FCD 99009A between the City of Peoria and the Flood Control District for the 91st Avenue and Union Hills Drive Drainage Improvement Project.

Mike Ellegood stated that there are two interdependent actions the District is asking the Board to review and take in this item. One corrects an omission in the previous IGA. The IGA failed to spell out the fact that the rights-of-way for the facilities to be constructed needed to be acquired. There is no budget impact. The second request includes a basin and related drainage facilities for the Rose Garden Lane/91st Avenue area of Peoria. The District is bringing this back as an amendment because there have been a number of recent developments in the north Peoria area involving some construction and traffic flow improvements. The fiscal impacts of this project will mean an additional \$1,050,000 of Flood Control District funding will be required.

David Moody, Director of Public Works & City Engineer for the City of Peoria, presented the joint 50-50 CIP cost share request for the Rose Garden Lane Basin. He stated that at the time when the City was putting this project together, they were still trying to finalize what the future drainage flows would be. The City originally budgeted what they thought was a reasonable amount of money (about \$1.3 million). By the time they were able to finalize design criteria for the project, the cost jumped to about \$2.1 million. The City requested an amendment to the existing IGA to include the Rose Garden Lane Basin at an estimated cost of \$2.1 million, to be shared on a 50-50 basis with the District.

Discussion:

Martin: Is the 303 Loop going in that area?

Moody: It is at the Happy Valley Road alignment and Lake Pleasant.

Martin: Will it eventually hook up with I-17?

Moody: The current approved MCDOT alignment is that it will hook up to Lake Pleasant Road, north on Lake Pleasant Road to State Route 74 (Carefree Highway) and then over to I-17.

Martin: Is it far enough away that it will not affect this project?

Moody: This basin will be at 91st Avenue to 83rd Avenue.

Rogers: How do you determine the quantity of the flow?

Moody: Peoria adopted the Flood Control District's standards as far as doing all the calculations. The City hired Goldman/Toy, who is a very well known hydrology firm, to do the drainage study. The City shared the results with the Flood Control District.

Callow: Having been in a similar situation on other watersheds, sometimes you get into the IGA before all the variables are known.

R.W. Shobe, Project Manager, presented the amended Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) FCD 99009A for the addition of the Rose Garden Lane Basin Project and the rights-of-way acquisition cost sharing for the 91st Avenue and Union Hills Drive Drainage Improvement Project.

The rights-of-way acquisition cost sharing was inadvertently omitted from the original IGA, but was included in the original \$4,300,000 District cost share. The City of Peoria asked that we amend the IGA to include this cost sharing provision. The estimated cost of the rights-of-way acquisition is \$2,054,000 and is to be cost shared equally. The District's total project cost will not exceed one half of \$8,600,000, which is the estimated cost for the entire project.

The amended IGA will also include the Rose Garden Lane Basin Project, which will require an additional \$1,050,000 of Flood Control District funding. The amended IGA also defines the responsibilities of the District and the City of Peoria for the project.

Ms. Lemmon mentioned that the adopted Resolution FCD 98-06 would need to be amended to include the Rose Garden Lane Basin Project. Mr. Ellegood stated that it was staff's intention to present the amended Resolution with the amended IGA to the Board of Directors without bringing the amended Resolution back to the FCAB. He asked if that was acceptable to the FCAB and they indicated that it was.

MR. CALLOW MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS. MR. CHERRINGTON SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5) Southeast County Planning Overview.

Tim Phillips, Project Manager, presented the Board with an update of the existing planning efforts and an overview of future planning efforts in the southeast part of the County. This item was for information and discussion only.

Mr. Phillips presented a review of the planning goals:

- ✍ Provide for public safety from flooding
- ✍ Be in front of development
- ✍ Be responsive to our client municipalities/agencies
- ✍ Provide CIP with justified projects
- ✍ Maximize community input
- ✍ Maximize opportunities for multi-use
- ✍ Identify Regional Flood Control Facilities

Mr. Phillips further presented a quick overview of the planning process:

- ✍ Flood control need identified due to existing or potential flooding
- ✍ Study area defined and prioritized within the County
- ✍ Study data collection, public involvement, environmental overview, visual overview, alternative formulation/analysis, selection of a preferred alternative, and implementation
- ✍ Identified capital and/or non-structural improvements to prevent loss of property or life due to flooding events

The total potential project costs over the next 10-15 years in the Southeast County is over \$300 million. There will be insufficient District funds to construct all the facilities. Development is strong in the northeast and southeast portions of the County. Development must participate in the construction of the projects. The public and private partnership is critical. The ADMS/ADMP program is valuable to identify flooding that can be avoided and/or fixed locally.

Discussion:

Martin: Of the \$81 million for projects requested but not budgeted, have any of them been scored?

Perreault: The \$81 million that Tim referred to has already been prioritized but has not been listed in our proposed Five Year CIP.

Patel: What concerns me are the capacity issues. Do these occur because the projects did not go through the process where all the flow quantities were identified?

Phillips: The SCS designed the East Maricopa Floodway as part of the FRS structures and their overall studies in the east County. They designed it based on a one-inch uniform rainfall retention over the entire watershed and essentially assumed sheet flow. With development in place, we recognized that that's no longer the case – that the basic assumptions for the facility designs are no longer there. The facility is undersized and cannot provide a 100-year flow capacity. From the hydrology/hydraulics aspects we need to look at what we need to do to provide that 100-year level of protection. This has not necessarily been something that was done wrong, but a change of the conditions.

Patel: When we spend such a large resources in planning, our goal should be to build a backbone where we have a high level of insurance that 20 years later we are not still fighting capacity problems. What I didn't see in the planning process is how do the incorporated areas give you the information about what they are going to do with the street patterns or how they are going to control development to put the water in where you've built the capacity? Otherwise you still wind up with isolated problems and continuing to spend funds to solve problems. They need to be a key part of the loop.

Phillips: As we looked at the hydrology and hydraulics for the East Maricopa Floodway, we looked at what the existing condition is and then what the future run-off condition will be. We want to try not to build to the existing condition because it will be oversized for the future once cities implement on-site retention requirements over the whole area. We don't want to undersize our facilities in the short-term either. It's a delicate balance of evaluating the run-off, how to contain the flow in the existing condition within the channel without spending an excessive amount. The models are developed with the cities master plans in mind.

Patel: Do all of the players we are dealing with have that sophistication? I image the larger cities are able to give you their 5, 10, 15 year plans, but how do some of the smaller cities fit in?

Ellegood: All of our client cities vary in degree of sophistication and sometimes in degree of cooperation and interest in this regional issue. Tim has been successful in educating them and working with them. In many of the east valley cities, we actually provide drainage inspections, so we are part of their development process.

Martin: Once the property is developed, will the main flow be as big as the sheet flow currently is?

Phillips: The existing conditions are worse than the future conditions. There will be on-site retention and the peaks will happen different than what the existing condition is.

6) West County Planning Overview.

Greg Jones, Project Manager, presented the Board with an overview of existing and future planning efforts in western Maricopa County. This item was for information and discussion only.

Mr. Jones outlined the tasks included in an Area Drainage Master Plan:

- ✍ Data collection – collect existing mapping and hydrology, identify visual resources & multiple uses, take in environmental consideration, historic sites to avoid, and cultural resource information.
- ✍ Alternatives Formulation – brainstorming session with the stakeholders to develop alternatives.
- ✍ Alternatives Analysis – screen the alternatives using a matrix to refine down to one alternative.
- ✍ Preferred Alternative Analysis – refine the alternative and take to 15% level conceptual plans and put into an Area Drainage Master Plan for the cities & jurisdictions to use.

The total projected cost for these proposed studies over the next 5 years in the West Valley is approximately \$9.9 million.

Discussion:

Martin: Did the project in Gila Bend by the school ever get proposed?

Perreault: To my knowledge, we did not receive any requests from the Town of Gila Bend.

Ellegood: I received an informal request about six weeks ago from the Town of Gila Bend asking that we reconstruct a levee and an outlet structure in a very poor section of their community. We sent a team to look at it, but it was beyond maintenance. It would require a major CIP investment and more engineering and analysis than we could do at the time. In addition, our records show that this property belongs to private ownership, so we need to resolve that. There is no doubt that this ADMP will spill out a couple of CIP projects that will be done over a period of time.

Martin: Several years back I went on a tour of the area and I thought they were going to propose a project. They really have a problem right by the school.

- 7) Comments from the Chief Engineer and General Manager. This item was for information only. No action was required.

Mike Ellegood mentioned that during this past month the District opened bids on the Phoenix Rio Salado Project. The District was pleased with the outcome. The Engineer's estimate by the Corps of Engineers was about \$12.6 million; the low bid came in at \$6.1 million. The groundbreaking will be sometime in June.

Secondly, Mr. Ellegood commented that the District, in collaboration with the Arizona Floodplain Managers Association, several cities and a lot of the consulting community had a very well attended and successful Southwest River Restoration Conference earlier in April. Representatives from the Corps of Engineers, several Federal agencies, and many State agencies were in attendance.

Mr. Ellegood noted that in December of 1997, the District along with the FCAB Chairman met with the Board of Supervisors and worked out several issues. A follow-up meeting has been scheduled with the Board, tentatively for August 7, 2000. The District will update the Board on what they've done, where they are going and what their program and plans are. Mr. Ellegood requested that Chairman Martin be available for this meeting and invited the other Advisory Board members to attend if they wish to.

Mr. Ellegood remarked on a meeting that was held last week where several members from the District, including himself, made a presentation before the Paradise Valley Town Council on the Doubletree Ranch Road Drainage Project. The District recommended that the Town enter into their half of an IGA. The Town reviewed both the IGA and the presentation and the IGA passed 7-0 before the Town Council. (Previously the Town Council had been divided 5-2.) Mr. Ellegood further stated that he received a request from the Town that the Flood Control Advisory Board reconsider the previous Board action item heard in February. Mr. Martin asked if they rather do that than go directly to the Board of Directors. Mr. Ellegood responded that the Board of Directors would ask that the FCAB hear this item. He further stated that there is at least one member of the Town Council that has asked that the FCAB hear the item. Mr. Ellegood was not certain if the remainder of the Council had voiced their opinion.

- 8) Summary of Recent Actions by the Board of Directors. This item was for information and discussion only. No action was required.

Mike Ellegood noted that everything that was sent to the Board of Directors passed. Of particular note was the proposed Drainage Fee Increase, which was passed with one dissenting vote.

- 9) Other Business and Comments from the Public. This item was for information and discussion only. No action was required.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m. by general consent.

Shirley Long
Secretary of the Board

Kathy Smith
Clerk of the Board